



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/611,519	07/01/2003	Vadim Fux	555255012436	4435

33070 7590 06/06/2007
JOSEPH M. SAUER
JONES DAY REAVIS & POGUE
NORTH POINT, 901 LAKESIDE AVENUE
CLEVELAND, OH 44114

EXAMINER

KE, PENG

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2174

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

06/06/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/611,519

Applicant(s)

FUX ET AL.

Examiner

Peng Ke

Art Unit

2174

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 March 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

This action is responsive to communications: Amendment, filed on 3/6/07.

This action is final.

Claims 1-17 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 14, and 16 are independent claims. In the Amendment, filed on 3/6/07, claims 1, 14, and 16 were amended.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-4, 6-11, and 14-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ni et al. US Patent 6,822,585 in view of Flanagan US Patent 6,292,769.

As per claim 1, Ni teaches an intelligent text input system for a mobile device, comprising:

A plurality of text input components, each text input component being operable to receive a text input event for an input device; (figure 2, input key pad; column 2, lines 40-70; As well as figure 7, column 9 lines 35-column 10 40)

A text input directing engine operable to receive the text input event from each of the plurality of text input components and translate the text input event into a platform-independent event, the platform-independent event including an index value that represents the text input event; (figure 1, candidate list, column 2, lines 60-70; As well as figure 7, column 9 lines 35-column 10 lines 40) and

A plurality of input methods, each input method being operable to receive the platform independent event from the text input directing engine and translate the platform-independent event into one or more input method specific characters based on the index value. (column 2, lines 40-45; Receiving input and identifies a number of characters is receiving input and translating the input; As well as figure 7, column 9 lines 35-column 10 lines 40)

Wherein the one or more input method specific characters is displayed on a graphical user interface by one of the text input components. (figure 1, candidate list, column 2, lines 60-70; As well as figure 7, column 9 lines 35-column 10 lines 40)

However Ni does not teach the text input directing engine being further operable to direct the platform-independent event to one of the plurality of input methods based on the text input component that received the text input event, wherein a plurality of text input events may be translated to platform-independent events and directed to different ones of the plurality of input methods.

Flanagan teaches the text input directing engine being further operable to direct the platform-independent event to one of the plurality of input methods based on the text input component that received the text input event, wherein a plurality of text input events may be translated to platform-independent events and directed to different ones of the plurality of input methods. (see Flanagan, column 14, lines 30-55)

It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include Flanagan's teaching with method of Ni in order to meet the need of translating real-time chat or conferencing messages into foreign languages so that subscribers who do not necessarily

understand the same languages, but have similar interests can participate in a single real-time discussion or chat.

As per claim 2, Ni and Flanagan teach the method of claim 1. Ni further teaches wherein the text input directing engine associates an active input method with one or more text input component. (figure 2, input key pad; column 2, lines 40-70)

As per claim 3, Ni and Flanagan teach the method of claim 2. Ni further teaches wherein the text input directing engine directs the platform independent event to the active input method. (figure 2, input key pad; column 2, lines 40-70)

As per claim 4, Ni and Flanagan teach the method of claim 1. Ni further teaches wherein the platform independent event includes event data indicating the state of the input device. (column 7, lines 10-25, status indicator is a event data)

As per claim 6, Ni and Flanagan teach the method of claim 1. Ni further teaches wherein the platform-independent event includes event data indicating the number of consecutive occurrences of the text input event. (figure 1, candidate list, column 2, lines 60-70; As well as figure 7, column 9 lines 35-column 10 lines 40)

As per claim 7, Ni and Flanagan teach the method of claim 1. Ni further teaches each input method translates the platform-independent event into one or more input specific characters of a different language. (column 11, lines 45-56)

As per claim 8, Ni and Flanagan teach the method of claim 1. Ni further teaches at least one input method applies an input logic function to predict a complete word or phrase from the one or more input method specific characters. (column 7, lines 10-24, candidate list)

As per claim 9, Ni and Flanagan teach the method of claim 8. Ni further teaches the one input method accesses a wordlist associated with one or more of the text input components to predict the complete word or phrases. (column 8, lines 30-40; Chinese input dictionary)

As per claim 10, Ni and Flanagan teach the method of claim 1. Ni further teaches the input device is a telephone-style keypad. (figure 2)

As per claim 11, Ni and Flanagan teaches the method of claim 1. Ni further teaches the input device is a miniature keyboard. (figure 2)

As per claims 14 and 15; 16 and 17; they are rejected under the same rationale as claim 1 and 8. Supra.

Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ni et al. US Patent 6,822,585 in view of Flanagan US Patent 6,292,769 further in view of Harel US Patent 6,384,843.

As per claim 5, Ni and Flanagan teach the method of claim 1. However, they fail to teach wherein the platform-independent event includes events data indicating the time at which the text input event was received from the input device.

Harel teaches wherein the platform-independent event includes events data indicating the time at which the text input event was received from the input device. (column 7, lines 53-61)

It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include Harel's teaching with method of Ni and Flanagan in order to provide user with a usability problem identifier.

Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ni et al. US Patent 6,822,585 in view of Flanagan US Patent 6,292,769 further in view of Kushler US Patent 6,646,573.

As per claim 12, Ni and Flanagan teach the method of claim 1. However, they fail to teach the input device is a virtual keyboard on a touch screen user interface.

Kushler teaches the input device is a virtual keyboard on a touch screen user interface. (column 12, lines 35-42)

It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include Kushler's teaching with method of Ni and Flanagan in order to reduce user's reliance on regular keyboard.

Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ni et al. US Patent 6,822,585 in view of Flanagan US Patent 6,292,769 further in view of Yu US Patent 6,271,865.

As per claim 13, Ni and Flanagan teach the method of claim 1. However, Ni and Flanagan fail to teach a loading and unloading mechanism operable to remove one or more of the input methods from the mobile device and add one or more additional input methods to the mobile device.

Yu teaches loading and unloading mechanism operable to remove one or more of the input methods from the mobile device and add one or more additional input methods to the mobile device. (column 2, lines 30-56)

It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include Yu's teaching with method of Ni and Flanagan in order to provide user with more character options.

Response To Argument

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-17 have been considered but are deemed to be moot in view of the new grounds of rejection.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2174

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Peng Ke whose telephone number is (571) 272-4062. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th and Alternate Fridays 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kristine L. Kincaid can be reached on (571) 272-4063. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Peng Ke

Kristine Kincaid
KRISTINE KINCAID
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100